UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/782,845	02/14/2001	Peter M. Mansour	SPROQ1100-2	9316

25548 7590 04/07/2004

MARK M. TAKAHASHI
GRAY CARY WARE & FREIDENRICH, LLP
4365 EXECUTIVE DRIVE, SUITE 1100
SAN DIEGO, CA 92121-2133

EXAMINER	
TRAN, MYLINH T	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2174	9

DATE MAILED: 04/07/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/782,845	MANSOUR ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Mylinh T Tran	2174

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *Amendment filed 02/02/04*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) 2-55 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) 2-55 is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date ~~8~~ 9
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Applicant's Amendment filed 02/02/04 has been entered and carefully considered. Claims 2, 6-9, 13-15 and 18 have been amended. However, limitations of amended claims have not been found to be patentable over prior art or record, therefore, claims 2-55 are rejected under the same ground of rejection as set forth in the Office Action mailed (09/29/03).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 2-55 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dillingham [US. 6,327,608] in view of Wolf et al. [US. 5,818,447].

As to claim 8, Dillingham discloses a user interface (UI) server at column 2, lines 28-63; retrieving a UI form definition stored at said UI server, said UI form definition specifying characteristics of a UI form (column 2, lines 22-68); instructing a client device to render a UI form corresponding to said UI form definition (column 3, line 45 through column 4, line 24 and column 7, lines 15-53); transmitting, from said UI server, a number of source data items for population in said UI form (column 3, line 45 through column 4, line 24); and

Dillingham provides receiving a command from said client device, said command being indicative of an offline action performed by said client device and said UI server processing said command for execution by said server-based application (column 2, lines 27-64). The difference between the claim and Dean et al. is the step of executing a server-based application configured to process source data items; and number of source data items being related to said server-based application. Wolf et al. shows the step of executing a server-based application configured to process source data items (column 2, lines 8-43, column 8, lines 28-68); and number of source data items being related to said server-based application (column 12, lines 33-68). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Dean et al. and Wolf et al. before them at the time the invention was made to modify the UI form definition taught by Dillingham to include the server-based application of Wolf et al., in order to access to utilizes native client user interface features to display data received from a server as taught by Wolf et al.

As to claims 2, 38, and 52, Dillingham also discloses the step of generating said UI form definition based upon a number of device capabilities for said client device (column 3, line 45 through column 4, line 24).

As to claims 3 and 53, while Dillingham teaches the step of receiving, at said UI server, Wolf et al. shows data representing said number of device capabilities (column 2, lines 43-65).

As to claims 4, 26 and 41, while Dillingham also teaches generating step generates said UI form stored locally at said client device (column 5, line 32 through column 6, line 5), Wolf shows based upon at least one native UI control (column 9, lines 40-54).

As to claims 5 and 27, while Dillingham demonstrates an operating system for said client device, Wolf shows one native UI control (column 9, lines 40-54).

As to claims 6, 7, 28 and 29, Dillingham also demonstrates receiving an action request representing a manipulation of said UI form by a user of said client device (column 4, lines 1-25 and column 5, lines 50-63); subsequently instructing said client device to render a new UI form in response to said action request (column 3, line 60 through column 4, line 24).

As to claims 9 and 30, while Dillingham provides the step of maintaining a shadow cache at said UI server (column 7, lines 32-65), Wolf et al. teaches data indicative of source data items (column 4, lines 1-48).

As to claim 9, Dillingham also provides shadow cache including associated with said client device (column 2, lines 28-55).

As to claims 10, 18 and 48, while Dillingham discloses UI server and the shadow cache, Wolf shows information representing new, deleted, or modified source data items (column 12, lines 32-68).

As to claims 11 and 32, while Dillingham show the shadow cache and UI server, Wolf teaches a list of source data items (email applications, column 9, lines 7-55).

As to claims 12, 33 and 55, while Wolf teaches a list of source data items, Dillingham also shows shadow cache and the saving step at locally by said client device (column 2, lines 28-38).

As to claims 13 and 51, Dillingham provides the transmitting step is performed in response to a manipulation of said UI form (column 3, line 45 through column 4, line 24).

As to claim 14, Dillingham also provides the retrieving step is performed by said UI server in response to a device identifier received from said client device (column 4, line 44 through column 5, line 12).

As to claims 15, 34 and 49, while Wolf discloses a total number of source data items (column 9, lines 7-55), and transmitting step initially transmits a first portion of said total number of source data items to said client device (column 5, line 22 through column 6, line 5). Dillingham demonstrates UI server having access to the total number of source data items associated with the UI form (column 6, lines 21-55).

As to claims 16, 35 and 50, while Wolf shows additional source data items, Dillingham discloses said UI server subsequently receiving a request for additional source data items and said UI server transmitting a subsequent

portion of said total number of source data items to said client device in response to said request (column 3, line 45 through column 4, line 58).

As to claims 17 and 36, Dillingham demonstrates UI server receives said request from said client device in response to a manipulation of said UI form (column 3, line 45 through column 4, line 24).

As to claim 19, Dillingham also demonstrates the step of said UI server sending, to said client device, a push notification corresponding to said push data (column 6, lines 30-55).

As to claims 20, 37 and 44, the claim is analyzed as previous discussed with respect to claims 1-3

As to claim 21, Dillingham provides the step of specifying a command script corresponding to a manipulation of a UI control contained in said UI form, said command script being configured for execution by said client device (column 2, lines 28-68 and column 6, lines 32-68).

As to claims 22 and 42, while Dillingham shows the UI server, Wolf teaches the step of executing server-based application (column 4, lines 32-60).

As to claims 23, 40 and 54, Dillingham discloses the step of storing said UI form definition at said UI server (see abstract, column 2, lines 28-47).

As to claims 24 and 25, Dillingham also discloses the step of instructing said client device to render said UI form (column 7, lines 20-65).

As to claim 39, the claim is analyzed as previous discussed with respect to claims 2-3

As to claim 43, while Dillingham shows the UI server, Wolf teaches the number of source data items represent a portion of a larger amount of related data available (column 2, lines 8-47 and column 4, lines 1-55).

As to claim 45, Wolf teaches an executable module corresponding to said server-based application, said executable module being activated in response to said request (column 12, lines 32-68).

As to claim 46, Wolf also teaches sending module being further configured to send said number of source data items to said client device (column 12, lines 32-67).

As to claim 47, Dillingham shows a shadow cache that stores source data items associated with said client device (column 7, line 51 through column 8, line 32).

Response to Amendment

Regarding claim 8, Applicant argues the prior arts do not teach "a command being indicative of an offline action". However, Applicant's attention is directed to the lines "The architecture has a browser and a user interface presented at a client. The UI might be stored locally at the client, or downloaded on demand from the server".

Regarding claims 2, 3, 20, 37, 38-39, 44, 52 and 53, Applicant argues Wolf does not disclose "data representing a number of device capabilities". However, Wolf shows the feature on column 2, lines 43-65. The system of Wolf shows program data representing on the computer device. Beside,

Dillingham shows the step of generating a UI form definition at 2, column 28-63. Dillingham shows a format of the User Interface. Therefore, the combination of Dillingham and Wolf teach the step of generating a UI form definition based upon a number of device capabilities for the client device.

Regarding claims 4, 5, 26, 27 and 41, Applicant has argued that Wolf does not teach "the use of at least one native UI control". Wolf shows "A frame is a boundary that bounds or frames a view port, and may include menus, toolbars, status bar.." which are the UI control.

Regarding claims 9, 11, 12, 30, 32-33, 47 and 55, Applicant argues Dillingham does not provide "the step of maintaining a shadow cache at the UI server". However, Dillingham shows the feature by a special memory system at the UI server at column 7, lines 32-64 "changing the color of the selected item or displaying a gray background". Also, Wolf teaches a list of source data items at column 9, lines 7-55 "when an object is linked, the source data continues to reside wherever it was initially created, which may be at another point in the document".

Regarding claims 10, 18 and 48, Applicant argues Wolf does not provide "information representing new, deleted or modified source data items". Wolf shows the features at column 12, lines 32-68 "The MAPI architecture is designed to make it easy for programmers".

Regarding claim 14, Applicant argues Dillingham does not disclose "a retrieving step performed by the UI server in response to a device identifier

received from the client device". However, the prior art shows it at column 4, line 44 through column 5, line 12 by citing a memory system for retrieving step.

Regarding claims 15, 16, 34, 35, 43 and 49-50, Applicant argues Wolf does not show "the transmitting of a first portion of a total number of source data items to the client device". However, Wolf shows it at column 5, lines 22-45 "It should also be understood that manipulations within the computer are often referred to in terms such as adding, comparing, receiving, sending, transmitting, replying...". Also, Applicant's attention is directed to column 3, lines 45-65 of Dillingham "The server has a file system that organizes files, such as web page and other documents".

Regarding claims 19, Applicant has argued Dillingham does not show "the UI server sending a push notification corresponding to push data to the client device". Applicant's attention is directed to the lines "When the client first attempts to connect, the server offers one or more authentication procedures...".

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and

the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Conclusion

Responses to this action should be mailed to: Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks, Washington, D.C. 20231. If applicant desires fax a response, (703) 746-7238), may be used for formal After Final communications, (703) 746-4395 for Official communications, or (703) 746-7240 for Non-Official or draft communications. NOTE, A Request for Continuation (Rule 60 or 62) cannot be faxed.

Please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT" for information facsimile communications. For after final responses, please label "AFTER FINAL" or "EXPEDITED PROCEDURE" on the document.

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA., Fourth Floor (Receptionist).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mylinh Tran whose telephone

number is (703) 308-1304. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 8.00AM to 4.30PM

If attempt to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner 's supervisor, Kristine Kincaid, can be reached on (703) 308-0640,

All Internet e-mail communications will be made of record in the application file. PTO employees do not engage in Internet communications where there exists a possibility that sensitive information could be identified or exchanged unless the record includes a properly signed express waiver of the confidentiality requirements of 35 U.S.C. 122. This is more clearly set forth in the Interim Internet Usage Policy published in the Official Gazette of the Patent and Trademark on February 25, 1997 at 1195 OG 89.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3800.

Kristine Kincaid

KRISTINE KINCAID
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

Mylinh Tran

Art Unit 2174